



bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding.”<sup>3</sup>

After reviewing Doe’s motion, brief in support, and index of evidence, I conclude that a reasonable observer informed of all the surrounding facts and circumstances would not question this Court’s impartiality. Additionally, neither the undersigned nor Judge Gossett has any personal bias or prejudice against either party, nor against any of the lawyers for the parties, and neither judge has personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED: The Plaintiff’s Motion for Recusal (Filing No. 257) is denied.

DATED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>3</sup>“If one of the provisions of section 455(b) applies then disqualification is mandatory whether or not a reasonable person would question the judge’s impartiality.” *Renteria v. Schellpeper*, 936 F. Supp. 691, 697 (D. Neb. 1996) (citing *Liljeberg v. Health Servs. Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 859 n.8 (1988)).